REMARKS

Independent Claims 1, 11, and 20 are amended to further define over the art of record. In addition, the substance of Claims 3 and 4 is added to Claim 1, and the substance of Claims 13 and 14 is added to Claim 11. Claim 5 and 14 are amended for proper dependency. Claims 1, 2, 5-12, and 15-20 remain, with no claim previously allowed.

The claims stand rejected as unpatentable over *Schneck* (US Patent No. 5,933,498) in view of *Alexander* (US Patent No. 6,134,593). The Applicants have previously pointed out (Remarks of Response filed June 16, 2004) a fundamental difference between their present method and the teachings of *Schneck*. That reference seeks to avoid any installation, that is, any permanent downloading, of a software product on a user's local machine. The present invention, in contrast with *Schneck*, permits downloading a software product in a controlled manner, under conditions recited in the claims. To further characterize this fundamental difference between *Schneck* and the present invention, the preambles of the independent claims are here revised to recite a method for permitting the controlled installation of a software product on to a local machine. *Schneck*, in contrast with the present invention, restricts distribution of software to decryption and execution (i.e., use) on a machine. (Column 29, lines 28-32; column 30, lines 26-28)

Claims 1, 11, and 22 are amended to add that the installer identifier is generated at the local machine based on the software product. That generated installer identifier is compared to a *stored* installer identifier on the software product. A complete installation of the software product on the local machine is enabled, in response to a match between

the generated installer identifier and the stored installer identifier. According to the present method as particularly defined in Claims 1 and 11, the stored license file (stored on the local machine in response to a match between the generated and the stored installer identifiers) is associated only with the software product installed on the local machine. That license file can be subsequently accessed to enable execution of the completely-installed software product on the local machine, but cannot be used with a separate software product.

Schneck, and *Alexander*, singly or in combination, do not disclose or teach a method for permitting controlled installation of a software product onto a local machine, and including the method steps recited in the amended claims. Furthermore, the Applicants again point out that although *Alexander* does disclose allowing a user to install and unlock a software application on a user's machine, Scheck prevents local installation of a software product. One of ordinary skill would see those two teachings as contrary to each other, and would not seek to combine those references as suggested by the rejection.

Furthermore, *Alexander* teaches a method including storing an installation identifier on a local machine such that the installation identifier, once defined, may be used many times for separate products from a given vendor (column 4, lines 37-39). This is contrary to the present invention which recites that the stored license file cannot be used with a separate software product.

Accordingly, the Applicants submit that the present invention as defined in the amended claims would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill from the art of record.

09/755,433

The foregoing is submitted as a complete response to the Office Actions identified above. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD

Date: January 10, 2005

Roger T. Frost
Reg. No. 22,176

Merchant & Gould, LLC
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
Telephone: 404.954.5100

27488
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE